

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,**

**Plaintiff,**

**V.**

**CHRISTOPHER L. GRANT,**

**Defendant.**

**CASE NO. 8:04CR267**

# MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the court on the Defendant's application for a certificate of appealability (Filing No. 89). The Defendant, Christopher L. Grant, seeks to appeal from the Memorandum and Order (Filing No. 84) and Judgment (Filing No. 85) denying his Motion Under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct Sentence by a Person in Federal Custody ("§ 2255 motion").

The federal rules of appellate procedure require that a defendant appealing the denial of a § 2255 motion file both a notice of appeal and a request for a certificate of appealability. Fed. R. App. P. 4, 22(b). In this case, only a request for a certificate of appealability was filed. (Filing No. 89.)

Nevertheless, the Court will review the request for a certificate of appealability. Before the Defendant may appeal the denial of his § 2255 motion, a “Certificate of Appealability” must issue. Pursuant to the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-132, 110 Stat. 1214 (“AEDPA”), the right to appeal the denial of a § 2255 motion is governed by the certificate of appealability requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) provides that a certificate of appealability may issue only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right. A “substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right” requires a demonstration “that

reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were ‘adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.’” *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (quoting *Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 n.4 (1983)).

For the reasons thoroughly discussed in the Court’s previously issued Memorandum and Order (Filing No. 84) denying the Defendant’s § 2255 motion, the Court concludes that the Defendant has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right as required by 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c).

IT IS ORDERED:

1. The Defendant’s application for a certificate of appealability (Filing No. 89) is denied;
2. The Clerk of Court shall provide a copy of this Order to the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals; and
3. A copy of this Order shall be mailed to the Defendant at his last known address.

DATED this 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2007.

BY THE COURT:

s/Laurie Smith Camp  
United States District Judge